arXiv:1405.4510v1 [cs.NE] 18 May 2014

A Memetic Algorithm for the Linear Ordering Problem with Cumulative Costs

Tao Ye[a], Kan Zhou[a], Zhipeng Lü[a,*], Jin-Kao Hao[b]

[a]*School of Computer Science and Technology, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, 430074 Wuhan, P.R.China*
[b]*LERIA, Faculty of Sciences, University of Angers, 2, Boulevard Lavoisier, 49045 Angers, France*

Abstract

This paper introduces an effective memetic algorithm for the linear ordering problem with cumulative costs. The proposed algorithm combines an order-based recombination operator with an improved forward-backward local search procedure and employs a solution quality based replacement criterion for pool updating. Extensive experiments on 118 well-known benchmark instances show that the proposed algorithm achieves competitive results by identifying 46 new upper bounds. Furthermore, some critical ingredients of our algorithm are analyzed to understand the source of its performance.

Keywords: Linear Ordering; Memetic Algorithm; Local Search; Recombination Operator.

*Corresponding author.
Email addresses: yeetao@gmail.com (Tao Ye), zhipeng.lui@gmail.com (Zhipeng Lü), hao@info.univ-angers.fr (Jin-Kao Hao)

1. Introduction

Given a complete directed graph $G = (V, E)$ with nonnegative vertex weight d_i and nonnegative arcs cost C_{ij}, where V is the set of vertices ($n = |V|$), the Linear Ordering Problem with Cumulative Costs (LOPCC) aims to find a permutation $\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_n)$ of the n vertices of G such that the following function is minimized:

$$f(\pi) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_{\pi_i} \tag{1}$$

where

$$\alpha_{\pi_i} = d_{\pi_i} + \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} C_{\pi_i \pi_j} \alpha_{\pi_j} \quad \text{for} \;\; i = n, n-1, \ldots, 1 \tag{2}$$

LOPCC was originally introduced in [1] to formulate a practical problem appeared in wireless communication systems. Since then, a number of solution approaches have been proposed to solve this problem. Benvenuto *et al.* proposed a heuristic approach based on greedy construction [2], which randomly selects a vertex from a reduced candidate list of the best available vertices and inserts the vertex into the permutation under construction. This algorithm is very fast, but its solution quality is generally unsatisfactory. Righini proposed an exact algorithm using branch-and-bound and a truncated branch-and-bound heuristic algorithm (TB&B) [3]. The truncation technique can reduce the running time by a factor of 10. Despite of its promising results, the high computational time cost of TB&B still prevented this algorithm from solving problems of size larger than $n = 35$ in a reasonable time.

On the other hand, a number of metaheuristic algorithms were proposed to solve the LOPCC problem and proved to be effective to find high-

quality solutions in a reasonable time. Some representative metaheuristic approaches include Iterated Local Search [4, 5], Tabu Search [6], Iterated Greedy-Strategic Oscillation and Path-Relinking [7]. Nevertheless, large instances (e.g., graphs with $n \geq 100$) still represent a real challenge for all existing LOPCC approaches.

This paper presents for the first time a memetic algorithm for solving the LOPCC problem. The proposed algorithm integrates a new local search procedure within the framework of evolutionary computing. In particular, the proposed algorithm employs an order-based recombination operator and a solution quality based replacement strategy for population updating.

The performance of the proposed algorithm is assessed on a total of 118 LOPCC benchmark instances from the literature. Computational experiments show that the memetic algorithm matches the previous best solutions for 61 instances and improves the previous best solutions in 46 cases. To provide insights about the performance of the proposed algorithm, we analyze the influence of some critical ingredients of the algorithm.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the key components of the memetic algorithm: The local search procedure, the recombination operator and the pool updating strategy. Section 3 gives the computational results and the comparison between the memetic algorithm and some state-of-the-art algorithms in the literature. Section 4 investigates several essential components of the proposed algorithm and conclusion is given in Section 5.

2. Memetic algorithm

2.1. Main Scheme

Memetic algorithms are known to be a powerful framework to solve hard combinatorial optimization problems (see e.g. [8, 9]). By combining the evolutionary framework with the local search procedure, memetic algorithms are expected to offer a balance between an intensified examination of a given search region and an exploratory discovery of new promising areas.

Following the general design principle of memetic algorithms [9], our memetic approach alternates between a recombination phase to generate new solutions and a local optimization phase to search around the newly generated solutions. Specifically, starting with a population of initial solutions, the algorithm repeats a number of evolution cycles (also called generations). At each generation, two parent solutions are randomly chosen from the current population. Then the recombination operator is applied to the parent solutions to generate an offspring solution which is subsequently optimized by the local search procedure. Finally, the population is updated with the improved offspring solution according to the solution quality of the offspring. This process is repeated until a stop condition (e.g., number of generations, computing time) is met.

The main scheme of the memetic algorithm is described in Algorithm 1, and the detailed descriptions of the four main components (i.e., population initialization, local search procedure, recombination operator and population updating strategy) are provided in the following subsections.

Algorithm 1 The Pseudo-code of the memetic algorithm

1: **Input**: The graph G
2: **Output**: The best solution found so far
3: $P = \{x^1, x^2, \ldots, x^p\} \leftarrow$ randomly generate p initial solutions /* Section 2.2 */
4: **for** $i = 1, 2, \ldots, p$ **do**
5: $x^i \leftarrow$ Local_Search(x^i) /* Section 2.3 */
6: **end for**
7: **repeat**
8: Randomly choose two individuals x^a and x^b from P
9: $x^0 \leftarrow$ Recombination(x^a, x^b) /* Section 2.4 */
10: $x^0 \leftarrow$ Local_Search(x^0) /* Section 2.3 */
11: $P \leftarrow$ Pool_Updating (x^0, P) /* Section 2.5 */
12: **until** stop condition is met
13: **return** the best solution found so far

2.2. Initial Population

The initial population is generated as follows. A random permutation is first created and then improved by the local search procedure (see Section 2.3). If the improved solution is not already present in the population, it is added into the population. Otherwise, this solution is discarded and a new random permutation is created. This procedure is iterated until the population is filled with p solutions ($|P| = p$ is the population size).

2.3. Local Search Procedure

Given a solution x (i.e., a permutation), we generate a neighboring solution by applying to x an operator called *insert*, which moves a vertex from

its current position i to another position j, denoted by $insert(i, j)$. This operator is widely used in the *classical* linear ordering problem (LOP) (see e.g. [10, 11]).

Our local search procedure is inspired by *forward* local search in [7], and is divided into two parts: *forward* and *backward*. Instead of employing the traditional method (select the best solution from the whole neighborhood, which is very time-consuming), the local search procedure considers the vertex (denoted by v^*) with the maximum α value. We assume that the position of v^* is pos_{v^*}. The set of target positions (T_{pos}) is composed of positions before pos_{v^*}. By employing *insert* move, v^* is moved from the current position to best target position chosen from T_{pos} with respect to the objective function value. If there is no improving move associated with v^*, we turn to the next element with the maximum α value. This process is called the *forward* part of our local search procedure, which is used in [7].

It should be noted that this procedure is much faster than the traditional local search method. The *forward* part is repeated until the current solution cannot be further improved. The *backward* part, which is opposite with the *forward* part, selects the vertex with the minimum α value. The set of target positions (T_{pos}) includes positions after the position of the selected vertex. The *backward* part is also repeated until the current solution cannot be further improved. This *backward* part stops when it cannot further improve the solution quality any more. Note that this *backward* part is missed in previous papers but it has significant influence on both solution quality and computational efficiency according to our experiments (see Section 4). The details of local search procedure is described in Algorithm 2.

To accelerate the evaluation of neighboring solutions, we employ a fast incremental evaluation technique introduced for LOP in [12]. The main idea is to maintain a special data structure to record the move values for swapping adjacent vertices. Particularly, each *insert* move is decomposed into several *swap* moves, which sequentially exchanges the vertices in adjacent positions. Experiments show that this method can reduce the computational time of the local search procedure by about 65%.

2.4. Recombination Operator

Previous studies suggest that the recombination operator is a key ingredient that determines the performance of the memetic algorithm. In this paper, we adopt the order-based operator which has been proven to be very useful for the classical LOP problem [12].

Specifically, two solutions in the current population are randomly selected as parent solutions. To maintain the diversity of the population, we restrict that the *similarity* (see Section 4) between the parent solutions should not be smaller than the average *similarity* of the solutions in the population.

Then, the order-based recombination operates in two phases. First, we copy one of the parents to the offspring solution. Second, we randomly select k positions of the offspring solution and reorder the vertices on these k positions according to their orders in another parent. Here, we set experimentally $k = n/2$ (n being the number of vertices of the problem instance).

For example, we assume that $x^a = (2, 3, 1, 4, 6, 5)$ and $x^b = (4, 1, 2, 5, 6, 3)$ are the two parent solutions and 2,4,6 are respectively the selected positions. Then, the offspring solution obtained by the order-based recombination operator is $x^0 = (2, 4, 1, 5, 6, 3)$.

2.5. Population Updating

The population updating strategy we employed is widely used in the literature (denoted by *PoolWorst*). This updating technique replaces the worst solution in the population with the new offspring solution if the offspring solution is good enough in terms of the objective value. Compared with some other updating strategies which consider both the solution quality and the diversity of the population, e.g., [13, 14, 15], *PoolWorst* strategy is able to accelerate the convergence speed, enabling the algorithm to find good solutions in relatively short time. Since our local search procedure is able to reach a balance between the search efficiency and effectiveness, it is more suitable for the updating strategy to accelerate the convergence speed.

3. Computational Results and Comparison

In this section, we assess the performance of the memetic algorithm on two sets of benchmark instances and compare it with the state-of-the-art algorithms in the literature.

3.1. Problem Instances and Experimental Protocol

Two sets of instances are used in the experiments. The first set of instances called LOLIB consists of 43 small instances with $n = 44$ to 60. This set of instances is well known for the LOPCC problem. The second set of instances named RANDOM includes 75 instances. Specifically, 25 of them are small instances of size $n = 35$, and the other two parts are large and difficult instances of size $n = 100$ and $n = 150$. These instances are widely-used in a number of studies, see for example [6, 7].

The proposed algorithm is programmed in C++ and compiled using Microsoft Visual Studio 6.0 on a PC running Windows XP with 2.4 GHz CPU and 2 Gb RAM. The population size is set to 15 for all the tested instances. The stop condition for the algorithm is a fixed number of generations. For the instances of size $n = 150$, the generation limit is set to 200. For all the other instances, the generation limit is set to 100. Given the stochastic nature of the memetic algorithm, each instance is solved independently 10 times using different random seeds (some large instances are solved 5 times).

3.2. Computational Results

Tables 1 to 4 summarize the computational statistics of the memetic algorithm. In each table, column 1 gives the instance name. Columns 2 and 3 respectively give the number of vertices (n) and the previous best-known objective values (f_{prev}). Columns $4-6$ report the statistics of the memetic algorithm: the best found objective value (f_{best}), the gap between our best results and the previous best-known results (g_{best}), the number of generations needed to reach the given f_{best} ($iter$). If there are multiple runs reaching the best objective value, *iter* stands for the average number of needed generations. Particularly, the number "0" means that the best found result is obtained during the initialization process. Column ($time_{best}$) gives the average computational time in seconds to detect the best objective values. The last column ($time_{total}$) shows the average total execution time in seconds. The last row named *Average* gives the average value for each column.

Table 1: Computational results on the 43 LOLIB instances

Instance	n	f_{prev}	Memetic Algorithm				
			f_{best}	g_{best}	$iter$	$time_{best}$	$time_{total}$
be75eec	50	5.085	5.085	0	100	8.53	12.83
be75np	50	16543433.910	16543433.910	0	91	9.13	12.90
be75oi	50	2.788	2.788	0	146	10.16	11.77
be75tot	50	297138.237	297139.434	1.197	29	3.84	8.46
stabu1	60	13.284	13.284	0	137	23.84	27.35
stabu2	60	14.029	14.029	0	89	20.03	29.76
stabu3	60	9.412	9.412	0	167	26.35	32.38
t59b11xx	44	76261.813	76261.815	0.002	38	3.02	6.93
t59d11xx	44	4086.303	4086.303	0	125	4.76	6.79
t59n11xx	44	1618.897	1618.907	0.010	90	5.12	8.23
t65b11xx	44	28230.444	28230.444	0	37	4.04	8.35
t65d11xx	44	3898.568	3898.568	0	53	5.26	9.06
t65i11xx	44	826108.100	826108.100	0	55	3.91	8.75
t65l11xx	44	2657.735	2657.735	0	13	2.34	9.75
t65w11xx	44	19.258	19.258	0	52	4.76	8.56
t69r11xx	44	14.036	14.037	0.001	8	1.83	7.66
t70b11xx	44	93.671	93.671	0	0	0.76	8.50
t70d11xn	6	1.80	8.93	0	6	1.82	8.93
t70d11xx	44	4.435	4.435	0	17	2.04	6.75
t70f11xx	44	1.267	1.267	0	69	3.03	5.94
t70i11xx	44	121146.029	121146.576	0.547	8	1.51	7.07
t70k11xx	44	0.492	0.492	0	55	3.56	7.32
t70l11xx	44	798.919	798.923	0.004	6	1.17	6.02
t70u11xx	44	35490330260.185	35490477444.038	147183.852	16	1.63	6.63
t70x11xx	44	0.231	0.231	0	5	1.07	5.03
t74d11xx	44	4.756	4.757	0.001	53	3.63	6.41
t75d11xx	44	5.059	5.059	0	19	2.01	5.16
t75e11xx	44	2062.289	2062.289	0	19	2.10	6.76
t75i11xx	44	4454.931	4454.931	0	0	0.72	7.41
t75k11xx	44	1.323	1.323	0	63	3.36	6.62
t75n11xx	44	9.897	9.897	0	61	3.12	5.61
t75u11xx	44	0.326	0.326	0	0	0.55	5.61
tiw56n54	56	2.645	2.645	0	1	3.42	19.85
tiw56n58	56	3.620	3.620	0	85	12.43	17.1
tiw56n62	56	3.024	3.024	0	79	10.63	20.07
tiw56n66	56	2.687	2.687	0	5	3.27	16.87
tiw56n67	56	1.877	1.877	0	45	7.54	15.43
tiw56n72	56	1.567	1.567	0	47	13.12	21.51
tiw56r54	56	2.626	2.626	0	80	18.35	24.42
tiw56r58	56	3.602	3.602	0	53	12.80	22.54
tiw56r66	56	2.189	2.189	0	136	17.48	22.61
tiw56r67	56	1.541	1.541	0	64	14.87	26.61
tiw56r72	56	1.349	1.349	0	86	14.97	23.17
Average	48.7	825773080.516	825776503.437	79.603	36	6.92	12.58

Table 2: Computational results on the 25 RANDOM instances with $n = 35$

Instance	n	f_{prev}	Memetic Algorithm				
			f_{best}	g_{best}	$iter$	$time_{best}$	$time_{total}$
t1d35.1	35	0.923	0.923	0	44	1.33	3.14
t1d35.2	35	0.167	0.167	0	27	1.76	1.96
t1d35.3	35	0.154	0.154	0	7	0.54	2.01
t1d35.4	35	0.196	0.196	0	41	1.06	2.03
t1d35.5	35	1.394	1.394	0	14	0.69	1.87
t1d35.6	35	0.200	0.200	0	67	1.27	2.33
t1d35.7	35	0.120	0.120	0	29	0.96	2.74
t1d35.8	35	0.226	0.226	0	11	0.79	2.03
t1d35.9	35	0.436	0.436	0	62	1.27	2.23
t1d35.10	35	0.205	0.223	0.018	6	0.51	1.67
t1d35.11	35	0.369	0.369	0	0	0.43	0.58
t1d35.12	35	0.234	0.234	0	38	1.03	2.07
t1d35.13	35	0.196	0.196	0	9	0.56	1.87
t1d35.14	35	0.138	0.138	0	37	0.94	1.93
t1d35.15	35	1.376	1.376	0	9	0.64	2.21
t1d35.16	35	0.286	0.286	0	11	0.67	2.12
t1d35.17	35	0.199	0.199	0	1	0.48	2.99
t1d35.18	35	0.381	0.381	0	7	0.57	2.43
t1d35.19	35	0.236	0.236	0	128	2.14	2.62
t1d35.20	35	0.068	0.068	0	43	1.13	2.23
t1d35.21	35	0.202	0.202	0	10	0.87	2.76
t1d35.22	35	0.177	0.177	0	5	0.43	1.77
t1d35.23	35	0.345	0.345	0	28	0.94	2.06
t1d35.24	35	0.132	0.132	0	12	0.53	1.7
t1d35.25	35	0.143	0.143	0	9	0.67	1.93
Average	35	0.341	0.341	0	11	0.84	2.17

Table 3: Computational results on the 25 RANDOM instances with $n = 100$

			Memetic Algorithm				
Instance	n	f_{prev}	f_{best}	g_{best}	$iter$	$time_{best}$	$time_{total}$
t1d100.1	100	253.988	**246.279**	**-7.709**	146	789	997
t1d100.2	100	288.372	**284.924**	**-3.448**	196	990	1060
t1d100.3	100	1307.432	**1236.237**	**-71.195**	142	771	993
t1d100.4	100	7539.979	**6735.661**	**-804.318**	196	913	948
t1d100.5	100	169.336	**162.423**	**-6.913**	196	1106	1136
t1d100.6	100	395.035	**391.662**	**-3.373**	189	763	784
t1d100.7	100	5936.281	**5641.137**	**-295.144**	170	798	1055
t1d100.8	100	2760.619	**2750.802**	**-9.817**	90	479	763
t1d100.9	100	62.942	**62.775**	**-0.167**	177	805	917
t1d100.10	100	162.942	**159.126**	**-3.816**	195	960	1076
t1d100.11	100	233.586	**230.810**	**-2.776**	112	567	996
t1d100.12	100	236.696	**231.176**	**-5.520**	178	954	965
t1d100.13	100	593.319	**578.307**	**-15.012**	187	888	919
t1d100.14	100	249.162	**247.313**	**-1.849**	132	747	947
t1d100.15	100	406.478	408.312	1.834	192	1081	1158
t1d100.16	100	707.413	707.413	0	86	492	983
t1d100.17	100	725.790	**718.920**	**-6.87**	156	801	853
t1d100.18	100	622.942	**621.940**	**-1.002**	110	653	842
t1d100.19	100	228.486	**227.374**	**-1.112**	130	674	1021
t1d100.20	100	255.151	**238.586**	**-16.565**	128	791	913
t1d100.21	100	228.590	**221.462**	**-7.128**	192	1131	1163
t1d100.22	100	159.336	**141.255**	**-18.081**	111	676	1068
t1d100.23	100	1658.168	**1656.877**	**-1.291**	196	881	935
t1d100.24	100	469.658	**468.863**	**-0.795**	180	875	1091
t1d100.25	100	644.782	**637.523**	**-7.259**	89	533	950
Average	100	1051.859	**1000.286**	**-51.573**	155	268	327

Tables 1 and 2 show the computational statistics of the memetic algorithm on the small sized instances. For the 43 LOLIB instances and 25 RANDOM instances with $n = 35$, the memetic algorithm can achieve, respectively, 35 and 24 optimal values within a short time.

Table 4: Computational results on the 25 RANDOM instances with $n = 150$

Instance	n	f_{prev}	Memetic Algorithm				
			f_{best}	g_{best}	$iter$	$time_{best}$	$time_{total}$
t1d150.1	150	8588.289	**8293.108**	**-295.181**	102	1075	1577
t1d150.2	150	184853.686	**159339.130**	**-25514.556**	172	1598	1819
t1d150.3	150	574943.633	**548507.282**	**-26436.351**	184	1604	1803
t1d150.4	150	75510.287	**68125.331**	**-7384.956**	199	1779	1817
t1d150.5	150	79069.363	**75426.662**	**-3642.701**	165	1609	1920
t1d150.6	150	46829.985	**46013.112**	**-816.873**	200	1688	1885
t1d150.7	150	161149.153	**150146.763**	**-11002.390**	200	1673	1731
t1d150.8	150	251940.422	**247564.438**	**-4375.984**	175	1606	1718
t1d150.9	150	364320.250	**363221.346**	**-1098.904**	197	1627	1675
t1d150.10	150	122217.421	**107685.011**	**-14532.410**	161	1500	1753
t1d150.11	150	13900.039	**12360.337**	**-1539.702**	190	1544	1729
t1d150.12	150	65717.265	**60614.534**	**-5102.731**	196	1676	1886
t1d150.13	150	109460.320	**105265.302**	**-4195.018**	160	1403	1906
t1d150.14	150	74854.867	**70153.934**	**-4700.933**	188	1786	1979
t1d150.15	150	352880.286	**321468.489**	**-31411.797**	193	1721	1779
t1d150.16	150	16950196.691	**16915821.128**	**-34375.563**	116	1114	1428
t1d150.17	150	77828.419	**74903.919**	**-2924.500**	182	1552	1786
t1d150.18	150	711286.599	**654737.416**	**-56549.183**	199	1571	1658
t1d150.19	150	67840.414	**66614.402**	**-1226.012**	193	1590	1733
t1d150.20	150	1886041.875	2074926.337	188884.462	200	1907	1911
t1d150.21	150	41453.911	**39248.997**	**-2204.914**	151	1356	1604
t1d150.22	150	695751.688	**671281.287**	**-24470.401**	139	1128	1774
t1d150.23	150	22203891.826	**21468279.568**	**-735612.258**	199	1563	1844
t1d150.24	150	105162.367	**101072.915**	**-4089.452**	194	1844	1888
t1d150.25	150	462316.511	465798.731	3482.220	153	1484	1703
Average	150	1827520.220	**1795074.779**	**-32445.444**	176	1560	1772

Tables 3 and 4 report the computational results on the challenging large instances. For these instances, the memetic algorithm is able to improve a number of the previous best known results. Specifically, for the RANDOM instances with $n = 100$, the memetic algorithm improves the previous best known results for 23 out of 25 instances (indicated in bold). For one of the remaining instance ($t1d100.16$), the algorithm can match the previous best known result. While for the instance ($t1d100.15$), our result is worse than the previous best known one. When it comes to RANDOM instances of size $n = 150$ (Table 4), the memetic algorithm improves the previous best known results for 23 out of 25 instances (indicated in bold). The results for the two remaining instances are worse than the previous best known ones.

In summary, the computational results establish the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed memetic algorithm. For the 68 small size instances, LOLIB instances and RANDOM instances with $n = 35$, the algorithm successfully matchs the best-known results on most of the instances in a short time. While for the 50 challenging large instances, RANDOM instances with $n = 100$ and $n = 150$, the algorithm is able to find better solutions on 46 instances within a reasonable time.

3.3. Comparisons with the State-of-the-art Algorithms

In this section, the proposed memetic algorithm is compared with two state-of-the-art algorithms in the literature, respectively named TS [6] and EvPR [7]. The experiments are done on all the 118 instances. We try our best to conduct the comparison on a time-equalized basis, so we set the generation limit (the stop condition) to be 110 for RANDOM instances with $n = 150$, and 200 for the rest instances, and run the proposed algorithm on each

Table 5: Summarized comparison of the proposed algorithm with two state-of-the-art algorithms on all the instances

Instances		TS	EvPR	Memetic
43 LOLIB instances	Obj.function	8.26E+08	**1.35**	8.26E+08
	Avg.deviation	1.40%	0.00%	0.00%
	Num.of opt	28	36	34
	Total CPU seconds	37.74	32.34	12.50
25 random instances with $n = 35$	Obj.function	0.34	0.34	0.34
	Avg.deviation	0.51%	0.45%	0.35%
	Num.of opt	21	24	24
	Total CPU seconds	3.40	3.75	2.17
25 random instances with $n = 100$	Obj.function	1161.46	1058.78	1034.30
	Avg.deviation	16.1%	5.8%	3.4%
	Num.of best	$\leq$2	$\leq$2	8
	Total CPU seconds	406.79	351.38	325.45
25 random instances with $n = 150$	Obj.function	2.27E+06	1.85E+06	1.90E+06
	Avg.deviation	11.64%	6.03%	7.07%
	Num.of best	$\leq$2	$\leq$2	1
	Total CPU seconds	2074.31	1127.24	1123.17

instance only once. Nevertheless, given the difference of computing platforms used for the compared algorithms, it is very difficult to replicate the exact stop conditions as those used in the reference algorithms. As a consequence, the comparisons shown in this section are for indicative purposes only and should be interpreted with caution.

Table 5 presents the results of these comparisons. Column 1 gives the instance name. Column 2 presents the four comparative criteria: the average objective value (Obj.function), average deviation w.r.t. the best-known result

(Ave.deviation), the number of instances where the algorithm can reach the optimal or best-known solution (Num.of best), and the average elapsed time on each instances (Total CPU seconds) . Columns 3-5 respectively present the results obtained by TS, EvPR and memetic algorithm.

As one can observe from Table 5, when comparing with TS algorithm, memetic algorithm yields better results in general. One each set of instances, the Obj.function, Ave.deviation and Num.of best of the memetic algorithm are better than the TS algorithm. The Total CPU seconds of the two algorithms on each set of instances are at the same level.

When comparing the memetic algorithm with the EvPR algorithm, one can observe that the performance of the two algorithms are roughly the same on the first two sets of small instances. For the 25 RANDOM instances with $n = 100$, memetic algorithm's performance is better. Its Obj.function and Avg.deviation are smaller than EvPR. However, when it comes to the 25 RANDOM instances with $n = 150$, memetic algorithm's performance is worse than EvPR. The reason maybe that, in order to conduct the comparison on a time-equalized basis, we set the generation limit of the memetic algorithm on these instances to be 110, and within this time period, the memetic algorithm still focuses on exploration and therefore the computational results are relatively poor. These results show that the memetic algorithm may has some complementary feature w.r.t. the EvPR algorithm. If in some applications, the allowed computation time is limit, one should choose EvPR algorithm. Otherwise, if one focuses on finding high-quality solution and allows to use relatively longer computation time, choosing memetic algorithm may be better.

4. Analysis of the Forward-Backward Local Search Strategy

Local search is a critical component of the memetic algorithm. Our local search procedure is inspired by the local search procedure proposed in [7]. However, the local search procedure in [7] allows only forward moves, our local search procedure allows both $forward$ and *backward* moves. In order to investigate whether this difference makes a meaningful contribution, we conduct experiments on some representative instances.

We keep other ingredients unchanged, and run two memetic algorithms, one with $forward$ local search and the other with $forward$-*backward* local search, on 5 random instances (t1d100.1 t1d100.2 t1d100.11 t1d100.12 t1d100.21 t1d100.22). To reduce the impact of randomness, each algorithm is run 20 independent times. The stopping criterion is the execution time which is fixed to be $400s$. We observe two characteristics : the average solution quality in the population and the population diversity.

Given two solutions x^i and x^j, we define the *distance* between x^i and x^j (denoted by $d_{i,j}$) as: n (the number of vertexes) $-$ the length of the longest common subsequence of x^i and x^j. Then, the population diversity (denoted by pdi) is defined as:

$$pdi = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{p-1}\sum_{j=i+1}^{p}(d_{i,j})}{p(p-1)/2} \tag{3}$$

With this definition, $pdi = 0$ implies that all the solutions are the same. With the value of pdi becoming smaller, the population diversity decreases, implying that solutions in the population tend to become more similar.

Fig.1 shows how the average solution quality (left) and the diversity of the population (right) evolving with the execution time. As Fig. 1 shows,



Figure 1: Comparison between two different local search strategies

the algorithm with forward-backward LS can usually find better solutions, and meanwhile its convergence speed is faster.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented a memetic algorithm for the linear ordering problem with cumulative costs. The proposed algorithm uses an order-based recombination operator for generating new solutions and an effective local search procedure for local optimization. The proposed algorithm was evaluated on 118 well-known benchmark instances and the results proved its effectiveness and efficiency. For the 43 LOLIB instances and 25 small random instances, the algorithm reaches 35 and 24 optimal values within a short computational time. In addition, it is able to improve the previous best known objective values for 46 out of 50 large instances.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful for comments by the referees for their comments that help us improve the paper. This work was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 61100144) and the RaDaPop (2009-2013) and LigeRo projects (2009-2013) from Pays de la Loire Region, France.

References

[1] Bertacco L, Brunetta L, Fischetti M. The linear ordering problem with cumulative costs. Eur J Oper Res 2008; 189(3): 1345-1357.

[2] Benvenuto N., Carnevale N., Tomasin S.. Optimum power control and ordering in SIC receivers for uplink CDMA systems. IEEE International Conference on Communications 2005, vol. 4, pages 2333-2337, 2005.

[3] Righini G. A branch-and-bound algorithm for the linear ordering problem with cumulative costs. Eur J Oper Res 2008; 186(3): 965-971.

[4] Villanueva DT, Huacuia HJF, Duarte A, Rangel RP, Valadez JMC, Soberanes HJP. Improving iterated local search solution for the linear ordering problem with cumulative costs (LOPCC). In: Setchi R, Jordanov I, Howlett RJ, Jain LC, editors. Knowledge-Based and Intelligent Information and Engineering Systems, Springer; 2010, p. 183-192.

[5] Villanueva DT, Huacuja HJF., Rangel RP., Valadez JMC., Soberanes HJP, Barbosa JJG. Iterated local search solution for the linear ordering problem with cumulative costs (LOPCC). In: Castillo O, Kacprzyk J,

Pedrycz W, editors. Soft Computing for Intelligent Control and Mobile Robotics, Springer; 2011, p. 395-404.

[6] Duarte A, Laguna M, MartíR. Tabu search for the linear ordering problem with cumulative costs. Comput Optim Appl 2011; 48(3): 697-715.

[7] Duarte A, MartíR, álvarez A, ángel-Bello F. Metaheuristics for the linear ordering problem with cumulative costs. Eur J Oper Res 2012; 216(2): 270-277.

[8] Moscato P. Memetic algorithms: a short introduction. In: Corne D, Dorigo M, Glover F, editors. New Ideas in Optimization, Maidenhead, UK: McGraw-Hill Ltd; 1999, p. 219-234.

[9] Hao JK. Memetic algorithms in discrete optimization. In: Neri F, Cotta C, Moscato P, editors. Handbook of Memetic Algorithms, Springer; 2012, p.73-94.

[10] Campos V, Glover F, Laguna M, MartíR. An experimental evaluation of a scatter search for the linear ordering problem. J Global Optim 2001; 21(4): 397-414.

[11] Garcia CG, Pérez-Brito D, Campos V, Martí R. Variable neighborhood search for the linear ordering problem. Comput Oper Res 2006; 33(12): 3549-3565.

[12] Schiavinotto T, Stützle T. The linear ordering problem: instances, search space analysis and algorithms. J Math Model Algorithm 2004; 3(4): 367-402.

[13] Lü Z, Glover F, Hao JK. A hybrid metaheuristic approach to solving the ubqp problem. Eur J Oper Res 2010; 207(3): 1254-1262.

[14] Lü Z, Hao JK. A memetic algorithm for graph coloring. Eur J Oper Res 2010; 203(1): 241-250.

[15] Porumbel D C, Hao J K, Kuntz P. An evolutionary approach with diversity guarantee and well-informed grouping recombination for graph coloring. Comput Oper Res 2010; 37(10): 1822-1832.

Algorithm 2 The pseudo-code of the local search procedure

Input: An initial solution x^0
Output: A locally optimal solution
improved $\leftarrow$ true
repeat
  improved $\leftarrow$ false
  for $i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, n$ **do**
    Figure out the vertex v^* with the ith large α
    Let pos_{v^*} be the position of v^*
    for $j = pos_{v^*} - 1, \ldots, 1$ **do**
      Swap the vertex on j and $j + 1$
      Calculate the objective function value $f^{'}$
      if $f^{'} \leqslant f_{best}$ **then**
        $pos_{best} \leftarrow j$ and improved $\leftarrow$ true
        $f_{best} \leftarrow f^{'}$
      end if
    end for
    Move vertex v^* to position pos_{best}
  end for
until improved = false
improved $\leftarrow$ true
repeat
  improved $\leftarrow$ false
  for $i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, n$ **do**
    Figure out the vertex v^* with the ith small α
    Let pos_{v^*} be the position of v^*
    for $j = pos_{v^*} + 1, \ldots, n$ **do**
      Swap the vertex on j and $j - 1$
      Calculate the objective function value $f^{'}$
      if $f^{'} \leqslant f_{best}$ **then**
        $pos_{best} \leftarrow j$ and improved $\leftarrow$ true
        $f_{best} \leftarrow f^{'}$
      end if
    end for
    Move vertex v^* to position pos_{best}
  end for
until improved = false